

III.REMARKS

1. Claims 1, 7, 10 and 11 are amended.
2. With respect to the rejections under 35 USC §112, first paragraph, the Examiner is referred to page 10, lines 9-10. Here it is stated that the operator may generate a message using a message generator application. In lines 11-23 it is stated that the operator can enter a note or remark associated with an appointment in the calendar. The message can be transmitted to selected recipients, possibly recipients associated with the appointment in the calendar. At lines 30-33 it is stated that the calendar application generates a message by performing an application call to a message generator application. Thus, it is submitted that the elements recited in the claims are supported by the disclosure.
3. Claims 1-4, 6 and 15-18 are patentable under 35 USC 103(a) over the combination of Ben-Shachar et al., US 6,208,996 (hereinafter "Ben-Shachar"), Lewis et al., US 6,738,635 (hereinafter "Lewis") and Frederiksen (US 2002/0080186) and what is known in the art at least because the combination does not disclose or suggest recording an event in a calendar application of a mobile device and then retrieving data from the stored event which is transmitted to another receiving device "through a communication network" at a predetermined time as recited in the claims.

Ben-Shachar discloses that a notification is provided. A calendar application allows the "user" to enter an appointment and an "associated user notification." (Col. 6, lines 52-54). The "user notification" can be audible or visible indicia that is "presented" to the "user" at a predesignated time before the appointment. (Col. 6, lines 54-57). Alarms can also be set. (Col. 6, lines 57-58).

Ben-Shachar also discloses that the user enters the time associated with the notification and the type of notification desired into the mobile device. The application receiving the information calls on an application programming interface to provide the "user" with

a desired indicia at the indicated time. Thus, Ben-Shachar does nothing more than allow the user to set an alarm or notification associated with an appointment that is stored in a calendar application. At a predetermined time, the alarm or notifications goes off, notifying the "user" of the appointment. (Col. 6, lines 54-57). However, what is not disclosed or suggested by Ben-Shachar is "generating a message" associated with a scheduled event and transmitting the message from the communication device through a transmission application and communication network to at least one recipient other than the user. In Ben-Shachar, the user that sets the notifications is the one who receives the notification. However, as recited by Applicant in the claims, the transmitting mobile communication device is sending the message to a recipient through the communication network. There is no such transmission in Ben-Shachar.

Further, the event scheduling element claimed by Applicant performs an application call to the message generator to generate a message associated with the scheduled event and "define" the recipient of the message from the "data associated with the scheduled event." In Ben-Shachar, the user sets the clock alarm notification or calendar notification by entering the time of the notification and type of notification. Ben-Shachar does not allow for defining the recipient of the message from the data associated with the scheduled event because in Ben-Shachar, only the user is provided with the notification in the form that the user has set. (Col. 6, lines 63-65). This is not the same as what is claimed by Applicant where it is the "message generator" that "generates" the message from data associated with the scheduled event.

Col. 7, lines 41-46, also referred to by the Examiner on this point only states that the "calendar notification scheduling system" schedules "calendar notifications" corresponding to appointments that are received by the calendar application program in the device. This is not the same as defining a recipient of the message from data associated with the event and transmitting the message from the device to a recipient as is claimed by Applicant.

Additionally, there is no disclosure in Ben-Shachar related to generating a “message” as is claimed by Applicant. Ben-Shachar only provides for audible or visual “indicia.” There is no disclosure related to a “message” as is claimed by Applicant.

Ben-Shachar does not disclose or suggest storing an event in a calendar application, and then sending event information or a reminder to **another device** using the data retrieved from the stored calendar event as is claimed by Applicant.

Lewis does not overcome the above noted deficiencies. In Lewis, schedule data alert messages are queued on the server. The schedule data alert messages can be modified by the user. The schedule data alert messages reside on the server until sent to a subscriber. While the message can be modified by the user, there is no disclosure here or elsewhere related to storing an event in a calendar application, and then sending event information or a reminder to another device using the data retrieved from the stored calendar event, as is claimed by Applicant.

Lewis offers the feature of accessing user defined event related data and sending data related to that data to a wireless communication device. (Col. 2, lines 31-33). Lewis allows a messaging originating entity 32 to provide data related to a scheduled event to a message receiving entity 34. (Col. 7, lines 43-46). The message originating entity 32 is a personal computer. (Col. 7, lines 56-57). The message generator claimed by Applicant is part of the transmitting “mobile communication device.” The data is retrieved from the calendar application of the mobile communication device, as recited in Applicant’s claim 1. Thus, Lewis cannot disclose at least this claimed feature.

The Examiner notes that the combination of Ben-Shachar and Lewis does not disclose and “event scheduling element” performing an application call to a message generator as claimed by Applicant. Frederiksen, which is relied on by the Examiner for this feature, only discloses that each application uses the editor for entering new data. Thus, while the user is in a “Call” application, the “Call” application uses the editor

application for entering the phone number. (para. 0113). However, what is claimed by Applicant is that the “event scheduling element” performs an “application call” to a message generator to generate a message. Frederiksen only allows that a particular editor program be used to enter data.

Frederiksen does not disclose or suggest an “event scheduling element” or storing an event in a calendar application, and then sending event information or a reminder to another device using the data retrieved from the stored calendar event, as is claimed by Applicant. Para. 0120 only states that the Calendar application 109 depends on input from the editor application, the “Notepad” application or “Message” application. This is not what is recited by Applicant in the claims.

Therefore, claim 1 is patentable over the combination of Ben-Shachar, Lewis and Frederiksen. Claims 2-4, 6 and 15-18 are patentable at least by reason of their respective dependencies.

4. Claims 7-9 and 14 are patentable under 35 USC 103(a) over the combination of Ben-Shachar, Lewis and Chou et al. (US 5902352, hereinafter “Chou”). Claim 7 recites a message generator application stored in the storage element and adapted to enable said operator to generate content of a message related to a scheduled event and configured to perform an application call to a transmission application adapted to process and pass the message to a recipient other than the operator, and to a timing application configured to record a predetermined time in a timing register, the timing application being adapted to notify the message generator application for causing transmission of said message to occur according to the predetermined transmission time.

The combination of Ben-Shachar, Lewis and Chou does not disclose the above-noted feature of claim 7 for reasons substantially similar to those described above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 8, 9 and 14 are patentable at least by reason of their respective dependencies.

5. Claim 10 is patentable under 35 USC 103(a) over the combination of Lewis, Ben-Shachar and Chou. Claim 10 recites features similar to those described above with respect to claims 1 and 7. These features of claim 10 are not disclosed by the combination of Lewis, Ben-Shachar and Chou for the reasons described above with respect to claims 1 and 7. Therefore, claim 10 is patentable over the combination of Lewis, Ben-Shachar and Chou.

6. Claim 11 is patentable under 35 USC 103(a) over the combination of Lewis, Ben-Shachar and Chou. Claim 11 recites features similar to those described above with respect to claim 10 and is patentable over the combination of Lewis and Chou for the reasons described above (see also the arguments for claims 1 and 7).

7. Claims 12 and 13 are patentable under 35 USC 103(a) over the combination of Ben-Shachar, Lewis, Frederiksen and Chou. Claims 12 and 13 depend from claim 1. The combination Ben-Shachar, Lewis and Frederiksen do not disclose or suggest all the features of claim 1 as described above. It is submitted that the combination of Ben-Shachar, Lewis and Frederiksen with Chou cannot as well. Thus, claims 12 and 13 are patentable at least by reason of their respective dependencies.

8. Claim 5 is patentable under 35 USC 103(a) over the combination of Ben-Shachar, Lewis, Frederiksen and Kawamoto et al. (US 7194558, hereinafter "Kawamoto"). Claim 5 depends from claim 1. The combination of Ben-Shachar, Lewis and Frederiksen does not disclose or suggest all the features of claim 1 for the reasons described above. It is submitted that combining Ben-Shachar, Lewis and Frederiksen with Kawamoto cannot as well. Thus, claim 5 is patentable at least by reason of its dependency.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now present in the application are clearly novel and patentable over the prior art of record, and are in proper form for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and

allowance is respectfully requested. Should any unresolved issues remain, the Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment for any fees associated with this communication or credit any over payment to Deposit Account No. 16-1350.

Respectfully submitted,



Geza C. Ziegler, Jr.
Reg. No. 44,004

17 August 2009

Date

Perman & Green, LLP
425 Post Road
Fairfield, CT 06824
(203) 259-1800
Customer No.: 2512